



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Book Reviews.

Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien. Erstes Heft: Textkritische und Quellenkritische Grundlegungen, 1893. Zweites Heft: Paralleltexte zu Matthaeus und Marcus. Gesammelt und untersucht von ALFRED RESCH, 1894.

As these parts are to be followed by others dealing with the Gospels of Luke and John and the Acts of the Apostles and closing with a statement of the total result arrived at in the course of these investigations; and as this work is to be succeeded by another on "Canonical Parallels," it would be obviously unfair to attempt a critical examination at present. The actual value of this wonderfully learned and laborious effort to contribute to the solution of the synoptic problem can only be rightly estimated when the whole can be passed in review. Meanwhile some account of the methods pursued by Dr. Resch and a brief statement of a few of his conclusions thus far are quite legitimate, and will no doubt be welcome to many who cannot consult the original, and to others who find it impossible to give the time and thought requisite for the intelligent study of these fascinating but unusually exacting volumes. The work was foreshadowed in 1889 by the remarkable book best known as *Agrapha* but also entitled *Extracanonial Gospel Fragments*, which was intended to be the forerunner of this far more extended inquiry. (See BIBLICAL WORLD, April, 1894.) It is maintained that the synoptic Gospels have underlying them an earlier document giving great prominence to our Lord's teaching which is most conveniently designated the *Ur-Evangelium*. It was written in a Semitic language, according to Dr. Resch in Hebrew, according to Professor Marshall in Aramaic. This detail however is admitted to be of minor importance although nevertheless considerable stress is laid on it at times in the course of the argument. Translations into Greek of this *Ur-Evangelium* (or of parts of it) were early made. Traces have been found, in our author's judgment, of three. One was used (if not composed) by the Jewish Christian who wrote our Gospel according to Matthew. Another, more Hellenic in its cast was used by Luke and Paul, the former knowing also and sometimes citing the earlier version. A third, still further removed from the Semitic original, is called the Alexandrian, being represented in the writings of Clement of Alexandria, in the Rainer papyrus, and other Alexandrian authorities. The Codex Bezae which is regarded as the one precanonical manuscript among the great uncials (that is, the one which presents a text prior to the last revision of the canon made in the fourth century) is believed, especially in the Gospel of Luke, to exhibit a

recension influenced by the first of these three versions of the *Ur-Evangelium*. Now in this codex, in the early translations of the Gospels, in the Diatessaron, in the New Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, in ancient liturgies and in patristic literature, there is a huge mass of variations from the canonical text. Many of these of course are worthless, but, when all due allowance has been made for careless quoting from memory and intentional perversion, there remains a mass of material which in the opinion of Dr. Resch who has collected and sifted the evidence with far greater care than any previous inquirer, points at the direct or indirect use of an extracanonical document that can hardly be anything but the *Ur-Evangelium*. Multitudes of these variations, it is argued, can be accounted for on the assumption of a Hebrew original which could be rendered into Greek in several ways. With the help of these our author endeavors to trace the *Ur-Evangelium* in the first and second Gospels. In 226 sections of varying length, as many passages, some comprising a verse or several verses, others only part of a verse or a single clause, are studied in this way. In some instances the parallels are very few. If only one has been discovered it is registered if of moment. In others they are many and diverse. The famous text, for instance, "Thou art Peter," etc. (Matt. 16:18), is illustrated by twenty-two references, most of which are cited in full; the words, "Think not I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy but to fulfil" (Matt. 5:17), by 25. Among the ancient authorities most freely used are the Clementine Homilies and the Apostolic Constitutions. The Rainer papyrus, the text of which it is thought may have been taken from the Gospel according to the Egyptians is utilized as far as it goes; and also the lately discovered Pseudo-Petrine fragment, the Docetic origin of which is clearly demonstrated. The passages referred to the *Ur-Evangelium* are often translated into Hebrew to show how the variations arose. In not a few cases the parallels are believed to indicate omission or dislocation in the canonical text of matter taken from the *Ur-Evangelium*. In the Lord's words to Peter mentioned above (Matt. 16:18), Dr. Resch finds an alteration subsequent to the formation of the first Gospel canon which he puts at or about 140 A. D. He shows by many references that there is no distinct trace of the passage as it stands in our oldest uncials in the whole Christian literature of the second century. The value of these 226 notes (several of which however rise to the dignity of dissertations) of course varies greatly. Dr. Resch himself admits the possible rejection of half his variants as mere synonyms; but is convinced that even then enough material remains for other inquirers to work up into fresh solutions of the problem. As to the extent of the *Ur-Evangelium* he goes further than Dr. Weiss, with many of whose views he heartily coincides, believing that his contributions to the discussion of the synoptic problem have not yet been duly appreciated by theologians. Instead of ending abruptly (as Dr. Weiss maintains) with the anointing at Bethany, the document included the passion, the resurrection and the great commission. One of the most striking and interesting portions of the book is the examination of the last five

verses of the first Gospel (Matt. 28: 16-20). This grand paragraph (with the exception perhaps of a clause or two) is all but proved to be a fragment, possibly a condensed fragment, of the *Ur-Evangelium*. Especially important and impressive is the demonstration of the antiquity of the trinitarian baptismal formula, and of its use in all circles orthodox or heretical in the early church. Never before, it may be safely asserted, has the subject been treated so fully and so ably. These twenty-nine pages containing as many as 104 quotations from ancient Christian literature are quite as worthy of separate publication as the much slighter, though very valuable note on the last twelve verses of Mark. (See summary in the BIBLICAL WORLD for December, 1894.) On the origin of the first two Gospels our author's views are as follows: The Gospel of Mark, the priority of which is considered to have been proved, was a collection of texts taken from the *Ur-Evangelium*, explained by sayings from the same source removed from their original context and completed by Petrine reminiscences. By his manipulation of his materials Mark produced a new setting of the Gospel story. The evidence of John the presbyter preserved by Papias is confirmed, thinks Resch again following Weiss by modern research. There are four points of correspondence between critical results and the presbyter's statements: (1) The influence of Peter's reminiscences; (2) selection of materials; (3) The effort at detailed description; (4) deviation from the original order. The Gospel according to Matthew, which is carefully distinguished from the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew mentioned by some of the fathers, is supposed to contain elements from at least five sources. The two principal authorities were the Gospel of Mark, which has been used almost in its entirety, and the *Ur-Evangelium*. Resch follows Weiss in the conclusion that, with the exception of a few small pieces, the whole content of Mark has passed into Matthew, the arrangement in both cases being the same. The direct influence of the *Ur-Evangelium* is seen principally in the didactic portion of the first Gospel, although the influence of Mark can be recognized even here. Very great importance is attached to the doublets, or cases in which a saying of our Lord's is given twice by the first evangelist, once as it stood in the *Ur-Evangelium* itself, another time from Mark's context and usually with his setting. "These doublets are the surest signs of the correctness of the two-source theory, the A, B, C of synoptic criticism." Besides these primary authorities there are several others which may be called secondary. The first and second chapters point back to the Semitic document independent of the *Ur-Evangelium*. Its title probably survives in the opening words of the Gospel which seem to refer not to the whole book but only to its first two chapters: "The book of the generations of Jesus Christ the Son of David the son of Abraham." Another secondary source (or pair of sources) is described as Petrine and connected with Jerusalem. This includes the story of Peter's walking on the water (Matt. 14: 28-31), the anecdote about the payment of the tribute money (Matt. 17: 24-27), the verses referring to the suicide of Judas, and some other portions of the narrative about the passion and the resurrection.

The hand of the compiler or redactor of the Gospel is seen in the twelve quotations from the Old Testament, each of which begins with "that it might be fulfilled which was said by the Lord through the prophet saying," or some similar form. In one short passage (Matt. 19:10-12) Essene coloring can be recognized. Whatever may be thought of the theories advocated in this book the unfinished character of which must be constantly remembered, it is a wonderful storehouse of materials, many of which are curious and not a few precious; and the accumulation and orderly arrangement of them constitute a noble piece of work for which all scholars ought to be deeply grateful. Had Dr. Resch done no more he would have rendered a signal service to students of the Gospels. But he has done much more. He has thrown out many fruitful suggestions, some of which are of great interest to the exegete as well as the textual critic. Note for instance the curious study on the meaning of the word "Galilee" in Matt. 28:6, the remarks on the parable of the wise and foolish virgins, and the instructive examination of the Manichean version of the parable of the wheat and tares preserved by Epiphanius. The second of the two parts under review is a valuable adjunct to the commentaries as well as an important addition to the works attempting to solve the riddle of the synoptic Gospels. A little more charity towards the one other student who is grappling with it in substantially the same manner, Professor Marshall, of Manchester, would have been welcome to those who believe that the Englishman is an accomplished and diligent scholar as well as Dr. Resch. It is not quite fair to refer to Mr Allen's articles in the *Expositor* as showing that Professor Marshall made an incorrect application of Aramaic without any allusion to the reply. If Dr. Resch has not seen that reply, or wrote before it appeared, he ought to have withheld his criticism. Mutual appreciation and tolerance are eminently desirable in a field of research where thorough workers from the nature of the case are very few.

W. T. S.

Studien zur Topographie des nordlichen Ost-Jordanlandes. Von DR. FRANTS BUHL. P. 20.

The most interesting part of these notes on the country bounded on the west by the Jordan and the Lake of Gennesaret, on the north by Hermon and the Plain of Damascus, on the east by the wilderness and on the south by Gilead, is the discussion of the site of Ashteroth Karnaim. Professor Buhl favors the site recommended by Leake, el Muzerib, a place a few miles to the south of the Yarmuk, which has long been the seat of a large and important fair. Here is a lake now called El-bagge with an island in the middle covered with ruins, some of which are ancient. The lake is regarded as sacred; and it lies on the route of the pilgrims to Mecca, which may be the old caravan road from Damascus to the southern part of East-Jordan district. The name has completely disappeared, but that is not surprising in this part of the